

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed November 22, 2004, in which: (1) Claims 27-31 were objected to; (2) Claims 22, 26, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,344,341 (YOSHINO); (3) Claims 1-10, 18-20 and 27-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over YOSHINO in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,713,762 (MITRA); (4) Claims 23 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over YOSHINO in view of MITRA and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,545,051 (SUMMERS); and, (5) Claim 24 and 25 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

By the present amendment, applicants have cancelled claims 2, 4, 6, 10, 18-20, 23 and 24, without prejudice and have amended claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 22, 25 and 26. Reconsideration of this application and entry of this amendment are respectfully requested.

In the subject Office action, claims 27-31 were objected to by the Examiner for informalities. Applicants have cured these informalities by their amendments and the withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

As for prior art, the Examiner rejected claims 22, 26 and 33-34 as anticipated by YOSHINO. Applicants have amended claim 22 to incorporate the subject matter of claims 23 and 24, the latter of which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Hence, independent claim 22 and claims 25-34 and 36 are now in condition for allowance. The withdrawal of the rejections of these claims and the allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-8, 18-20 and 27-32 over the combination of YOSHINO and MITRA. Applicants have amended the claims in a manner that patentably defines over this combination. Independent claim 1 calls for a housing with a bottom surface where the board-engaging members run transverse across the bottom surface between adjacent terminal-receiving cavities. It also calls for the board-engaging members to create spaces between the bottom surface of the connector housing and the circuit board which can accommodate the tail portions of the terminals that are held in the cavities of the housing. YOSHINO shows no standoffs or members of that type that support the bottom surface of the housing off the surface of a circuit board to create spaces through which the terminal tails can extend. In MITRA, the standoffs, do not extend entirely across the width of the bottom surface from side to side between adjacent terminal-receiving cavities. Nor do the terminal assemblies of MITRA contain a pair of terminals,

all as called for in amended claim 1. To change either YOSHINO or MITRA to render claim 1 obvious would be a massive rework of both of their structures.. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection of claims , 3, 5 and 7-9 and the allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Lastly, the obviousness rejection of claims 23 and 26 has been addressed by the amendments to claim 22.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: Friday 8, 2005

By: Thomas D. Paulius

Thomas D. Paulius
Registration No. 30,792

Mailing Address:

Thomas D. Paulius
MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4897
Fax.: (630) 416-4962